

**EXPEDITED REVIEW REQUESTED**  
**Patent**

Certificate of Mailing/Transmission (37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

☐ **ELECTRONIC FILING**  
transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark  
Office's EFS-Web System

☒ **FACSIMILE**  
transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office,  
(571) 273-8300

Ryan K. Simmons  
Name of Person Certifying

03/28/2006

Date

[Signature]  
Signature of Person Mailing Paper and Fee

**In the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

**Date:** March 28, 2006

**In re Application of:** Ditlow, et al.

**Filed:** 07/19/2002

**For:** Method and Apparatus to Manage Multi-Computer Demand

**Serial Number:** 10/064,486

**Confirmation Number:** 2900

**Art Unit:** 2128

**Examiner:** Thai Q. Phan

**RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks  
Alexandria, VA 22313

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 14, 2006, which is due for response by May 15, 2006. Any fees required in entering this response may be charged to Applicant's deposit account, 09-0456.

It is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered in the above referenced application and reconsideration of the application in view of these comments be made. No new matter has been included.

### **Remarks**

In the Specification the disclosure is objected to by the Examiner because of informalities, citing unclear expressions in paragraphs: [0044], [0046], [0050]-[0052], [0067], [0073], [0081]. Applicants telephoned the Examiner on March 22, 2006 to further clarify Examiner's objection to the Specification as filed. During the telephone call it was discovered that the expressions in the copy of the application the Examiner was reviewing were in fact different than that of those in the application as originally filed. In the Examiner's copy a number of the symbols, notations, and scripts in the expressions specified in the paragraphs above appeared different from the original application as filed. Applicants filed the original application electronically, and can only assume that the symbols, notations, and scripts in the original application were incorrectly interpreted and captured by the USPTO's electronic application system.

Applicants are resubmitting the original specification as filed on July 19, 2002, and certify that it is a true and accurate copy of the application as originally filed. Applicants, respectfully request reconsideration of the Specification. Applicants, further request that the Final Office Action of February 14, 2006 be made non-final as the basis of the rejection is due to a typographical error in the reproduction of Applicants' Specification at the USPTO and not due to Applicants' error or doing.

### Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending application is in condition for allowance and that the application may be passed to issuance.

The Examiner is urged to call the undersigned at the number listed below if, in the Examiner's opinion, such a phone conference would aid in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: Gary Ditlow, et al.

By: 

Ryan K. Simmons  
Registration No. 45,848  
Telephone No.: (802) 769-1809  
Fax No.: (802) 769-8938  
EMAIL: rksimmon@us.ibm.com

International Business Machines Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law - Mail 972E  
1000 River Road  
Essex Junction, VT 05452